



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,419	06/12/2001	Bill J. Coe	7282.4820	6102

22235 7590 12/20/2005

MALIN HALEY AND DIMAGGIO, PA
1936 S ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316

EXAMINER

DINH, TIEN QUANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/879,419		COE, BILL J.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Tien Dinh		3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Drawings

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 3/26/03 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(f) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of elements 100, 102, 110, 120.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it does not contain the brief description of figures 14-17.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner has difficulty understanding the claimed limitation of “whereby metal usage in the connecting is minimized.” How is it minimized? Is the applicant positively claiming the use of metal in the connecting? If so, what is it? How is the minimized metal usage related to the connecting? It is difficult to understand.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, 17, and 22-24, as best understood, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson et al.

Peterson et al discloses a soft link, one-piece structure 10 with a permanently looped first end 12 (see figure 3) and second looped end 11 having a tab/lump 13. The soft link is made out of rope/high strength material. The first and second end member can be removably attached to each other to define a single attachment area so that the first and second member can be connected. When the first and second member are connected to the attachment point of the first and second end of the body member, first and second member can be cinched because they are tightly attached to each other. Please note that Peterson et al has a permanently and intrinsically looped first and second end. Since there is no metal being used connection, metal usage is minimized in Peterson et al's system. Furthermore, one skilled in the art can easily add a strip of metal to the connection to minimized the connection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3644

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson et al.

Calthrop discloses a parachute having a group of parachute suspension lines and a second member that is a riser both with openings that are attached together by a member but a is silent on the soft link to tie the first and second members together. However, Peterson et al teaches that soft links that can be used to tie the parachute suspension lines to the riser through the openings are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Peterson et al's soft links in place of Calthrop linking means for easy manufacturing and for saving weight.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder '789 and Peterson et al.

Booth discloses a pilot parachute having a bridle cord 15 and a second member that is a canopy 16 but is silent on the canopy and bridle lines having openings and the soft link to tie the bridle cord and canopy together. However, Peterson et al teaches that soft links that can be used to tie the canopy and the bridle through the openings are well known in the art. Snyder teaches canopy and bridle lines having openings are well known in the art.

Art Unit: 3644

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the canopy and bridle lines have openings (as taught by Snyder) and Peterson et al's soft links in Booth's system to easily attach the canopy to the bridle lines and to easily repair the system if needed.

Claims 15, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al in view of Dennington.

Peterson et al discloses all parts except for the soft link being made out of nylon. However, Dennington discloses that soft links made out of nylon are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the soft link of Peterson et al out nylon as taught by Dennington to create a stronger structure.

Re claims 16, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used bartack thread in Peterson et al's system to create a stronger structure. Further, the criticality of using bartack thread has not been disclosed.

Re claim 21, please note it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used labels in Peterson et al's system to provide instructions or advertise the brand.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments on the 35 U.S.C 112 rejection, the Examiner maintains that the rejection. The phrase clearly is vague since it is not known what the applicant is claiming. Please see the other questions that are raised in the rejection also.

Art Unit: 3644

As for applicant's arguments on the Peterson et al reference, the Examiner would like to point out the independent claims calls for a soft link but does not claimed the specific parachute parts. Also, the Peterson et al reference discloses the structure that has been claimed. Peterson et al clearly can be used to link parts of the parachute together.

In response to applicant's argument that Peterson et al is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Peterson et al teaches a soft link that is capable of linking parts of the parachute together.

In response to the Calthrop reference, Calthrop discloses a parachute having a group of parachute suspension lines and a second member that is a riser both with openings. The examiner used this to show that these parts are well known in the art. Peterson et al was used to show that soft links that can be used to tie the parachute suspension lines to the riser through the openings are well known in the art. Hence, it would have been obvious to use soft links to tie elements together. Calthrop does not teach away from the present invention.

In response to the Booth reference, Booth discloses a pilot parachute having a bridle cord 15 and a second member that is a canopy 16 but is silent on the canopy and bridle lines having openings and the soft link to tie the bridle cord and canopy together. The examiner used this to show that these parts are well known in the art. Peterson et al was used to show that soft links that can be used to tie the parachute suspension lines to the riser through the openings are well

Art Unit: 3644

known in the art. Hence, it would have been obvious to use soft links to tie elements together.

Booth does not teach away from the present invention.

As for the Dennington reference, please note that this was used to show that soft links made out of nylons are well known in the art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tien" followed by a stylized flourish.